

Jan 15, 2008

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

FCC (Federal Communications Commission Public Comments)
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED
MAR 10 2008

Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDS into their own set-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Now ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market

competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on

by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition. Please refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Mr. Hubert Kirchgaessner
1363 Sequoia Ln
Hebron, KY 41048-9338


No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

FOR HUBERT KIRCHGAESSNER

Complaint Type: Wireline

Account Type: Residential

☐ Congressional Complaint ☐

IC Number:	08-F0289934	Case Type:	
Date Received:	01/18/2008 	Complainant:	Hubert Kirchgaessner
Date Entered:	01/18/2008	Date Assigned:	01/18/2008
Entered By:	PORTALSV1	Date Reassigned:	01/30/2008
Assigned To:	Vivian Jones/FCCIN	Service Date:	
Date Closed:		Response Date:	
Closed By:		Original Analyst:	Jane Cherego/FCCIN
Close Letter Needed?	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes <input type="radio"/> No	Purged By:	Purged Date:
		Removed By:	Removed Date:
Supervisor Check:	<input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No	Indecency Referral Code:	

Current Status: Pending Analyst Review

[View Complaint](#)

Associated Case:

Complaint Summary:

Apparent Carrier(s):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Yes<<< Check here if you wish to serve both a Wireline and Wireless carrier.	
Problem Number:	
Title: None	First Name: Hubert
Contact Name:	Hubert Kirchgaessner
Contact Number:	Ext.
Fax Number:	
Email Address:	
PO Box:	
City:	Hebron
Middle Initial:	Last Name: Kirchgaessner
Best Time to Call:	
Consumer's Telephone Number:	Ext.
TTY Number:	
Internet Address:	
Address:	1363 Sequoia Ln
State: KY	Zip: 41048

On Behalf Of:	
Company Name:	
Party's Name:	Relationship with the Party:
Party's Contact Number: Ext.	PO Box:
	Address:
	City:State:Zip:
Other Party that can be contacted?	
Name:	Relationship:
Contact Number: Ext.	Address:
	City:, State: Zip:
**Amount of credit FCC effort generated:	Duplicate Credit Checked: <input type="radio"/> Yes <input checked="" type="radio"/> No

Have you paid any of the disputed charges?

Did the company billing for these charges adjust or refund some or all of the disputed charges?

If yes, what was the amount of the adjustment or refund?

b. Telephone number for the carrier(s) or company(ies) involved

with your complaint, including area code:

Phone: Ext:

c. Which type of service is involved with your complaint:

TCPA Information from 475

1. the telephone number of the individual or company who called or faxed you:
2. your telephone number(s) on which the call or fax was received:
3. a description of the telemarketing call, pre-recorded message, or unsolicited fax, including an identification of the company whose products or services were being advertised, and any phone numbers that were included in the call or fax:
4. the "opt-out" number(s) provided in the call(s) or on the fax(es):
(List number(s) given in the call(s) or fax(es) for you to contact if you do not want to receive any additional calls or faxes.)
5. Have you: (a) purchased anything from the company being advertised in the call or fax;
(b) made an inquiry or application to that company; or (c) given consent to the company to send you the call or fax? If so, please describe and state when you had such contact with the company.

Ext:

Ext:

Ext:

(1) Date of Program:

(2) Time of Program:

(3) Network:

(4) Call Sign, Channel OR Frequency of the station on which you viewed/heard the material:

(5) City and State Where Program Was Viewed:

(6) Name of Program or DJ/Personality/Song/Film:

Updated? ☐ Yes ☒ No

ANALYSIS SECTION

Correspondence Type:

☐ Complaint ☒ Inquiry

Source Code:

Postal Mail

Apparent Carrier(s):

Re-Serve Carrier(s):



Responding Carrier(s):

Assigned Subject Code:

OTHER

Other Code Description

Non serve broadcast comments on Docket 97-80, closed, printed out and placed in supervisors mail tray (CD), no action taken or warranted.

Activity Code:

Direct

Assigned Code Acronym:

OTHE

Final Responsible Party:

Sub-Category:



Other (OTHE)

Additional Sub-Category:



Copy of Response Sent to Consumer by Carrier?:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Mediation with Carrier/Complainant?:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Response Type:

Referral Information

Date Referred:

Consumer Referral Letter Agency Refe

Indecent - R

Referred To:

Agency Name(s):



Company Name(s):



General Acknowledgement

Indecent Dismissal

Non DNC - More Information

DNC - Enforcement

DNC - Exemption

DNC - More Information

Create TC

TFAX E

TFAX

TFAX More

DNC Citation
DNC No Action

TF
TFAX

Actionable Case:

☐ Actionable ☒ NonActionable

DNC Enforcement Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

TFAX Enforcement Letter Generated?

DNC More Info Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

TFAX Exemption Letter Generated?

DNC Exemption Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

TFAX More Info Letter Generated?

Non DNC More Info Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

TFAX Citation Letter Generated?

DNC Citation Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

☐ Yes ☒ No

TFAX No Action Letter Generated?

DNC No Action Letter Generated?

☐ Yes ☒ No

Deferment Information

Date Deferred:

Reason:

None

Date UnDeferred:

Extension Information:

Extension Requested:

☐ Yes ☒ No

Extension Granted:

☐ Yes ☒ No

SERVE INFORMATION

COMMENTS

Comment History:

01/31/2008-Vivian Jones Non serve broadcast comments on Docket 97-80, closed, printed out and placed in supervisors mail tray (CD), no action taken or warranted. vlj

01/31/2008-Vivian Jones Non serve broadcast comments on Docket 97-80, closed, printed out and placed in supervisors mail tray (CD), no action taken or warranted. vlj

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Created by

OSCARServer

Date

01/18/2008 06:01 PM

Last Edited by

Date

Jan 26, 2008

FCC (Federal Communications Commission Public Comments)
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

DOCKET 97-80
FILED/ACCEPTED
MAR 6 2008
DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDs into their own set-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Now ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market

competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on

by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition. Please refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Mr. Lee Oeth
11335 Carmel Creek Rd
San Diego, CA 92130-2634

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List A B C D E

DOCKET 97-80

Jan 26, 2008

FCC (Federal Communications Commission Public Comments)
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED
MAR 10 2008
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDs into their own set-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Now ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market

competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on

by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition. Please refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Ms. Lora Saltarelli
2877 Lone Pine Ln
Naples, FL 34119-9764

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

FILED/ACCEPTED
MAR 10 2003
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

Jan 28, 2008

FCC (Federal Communications Commission Public Comments)
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDS into their own set-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Now ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market

competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on

by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition. Please refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Mr. George E. Bourous
2636 14th St
Astoria, NY 11102-3719

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E

Jan 28, 2008

FCC (Federal Communications Commission Public Comments)
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

FILED/ACCEPTED
MAR 10 2008
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary

As a consumer interested in protecting competition, innovation, and legitimate use of cable TV content, I urge you to refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1) by NCTA, Charter, Verizon, and all other cable providers. The FCC's integration ban, which in effect requires cable companies to integrate CableCARDs into their own set-top boxes, remains good policy today.

Now ten years after the Telecommunications Act of 1996, cable companies have dragged their feet long enough on competitive alternatives to proprietary set-top boxes, thus hampering innovation and harming consumers. The integration ban will also help market

competition prevent further restrictions on cable subscribers' ability to make legitimate use of recorded content.

By adopting content protection limits (encoding rules) in docket no. 97-80, the Commission recognized the importance of allowing consumers to make certain uses of TV content, regardless of a particular cable provider's or copyright holder's wishes. With competition spurred on

by the integration ban, consumers would have the freedom to choose the least restrictive cable-compatible device available. The CableCARD standard already prescribes restrictions that harm consumers by limiting non-infringing uses, and such restrictions will get even worse if cable providers' set-top boxes are unchecked by competition. Please refuse requests for waivers of 47 CFR 76.1204(a)(1).

Sincerely,

Mr. duane nycz
PO Box 923
Soap Lake, WA 98851-0923

No. of Copies rec'd 0
List A B C D E
